

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-13 are all the claims pending in the present application, new claim 13 having been added as indicated herein. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Also, Fig. 1 is objected to for the reasons set forth on page 3 of the Office Action.

With respect to Fig. 1, Applicant amends Fig. 1, as set forth in the attached hand-corrected Fig. 1. Applicant believes that the changes to Fig. 1 obviate the Examiner's objection thereto. Applicant's amendment to Fig. 1 is based on the descriptions in the specification of components 13 and 14, respectively.

**§ 112, second paragraph, Rejections - Claims 1-12**

The Examiner rejects claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for the reasons set forth on page 2 of the Office Action.

With respect to claim 1 and allegedly throughout claims 2-12, the Examiner alleges that the uses of "interference" are indefinite. In response, Applicant submits that the uses of "interference" are NOT indefinite as one skilled in the art would recognize that interference can mean, for example, an obstruction or confusion of a signal(s) due to the presence of noise or other signal(s). *See Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary*. Therefore, at least based on the foregoing, Applicant submits that the uses of "interference" are clear and definite such that 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is satisfied. Also, Applicant amends claim 1 in an effort to further clarify the claimed invention.

Also, on page 2, the Examiner makes specific mention of other portions of claims 1 and 11, that he found objectionable. Applicant amends claims 1, 7, and 11, as indicated herein, and Applicant believes that these amendments obviate the Examiner's rejections of claim 1-12.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. APPLN. NO.: 10/699,814


ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. Q78147

Finally, Applicant adds new claim 13, as indicated herein, in an effort to obtain a varying scope of protection. Applicant believes that this claim is patentable at least for reasons similar to those set forth in claim 1.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Diallo T. Crenshaw  
Registration No. 52,778

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: June 9, 2004



FIG. 1

